Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 17, 2009

I.   Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed August 17, 2009, Claims 12-31 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 12-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connor (U.S. Patent No. 6,865,549, hereinafter Connor) in view of Orton, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,465,363, hereinafter Orton).

II.   Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 12, 22, and 31; cancels Claims 21 and 30; and adds new Claims 32-33, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 12-20, 22-29, and 31-33.

III.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 & 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 12-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Connor (U.S. Patent No. 6,865,549, hereinafter Connor) in view of Orton, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,465,363, hereinafter Orton).

Claim 12

Claim 12 has been amended to recite as follows.

12. (Currently Amended)   A   system   for   interleaving   resource   enlistment synchronization, comprising:

an application server with a plurality of threads, running on one or more processors;

a transaction manager, wherein the transaction manager maintains an enlistment data structure to manage resource object enlistment in a plurality of transactions, wherein each transaction is associated with one or more different said threads, and wherein the enlistment data structure maintains a mapping of resource and transaction identification information;

6

one or more resource objects, wherein each resource object is wrapped with a wrapper object, wherein the transaction manager uses the wrapper object to synchronize concurrent enlistment requests from different said threads associated with different transactions;

wherein, after receives a request from one thread of the plurality of threads to enlist one of the one or more resource objects in one transaction, the transaction manager

first checks to see if there is a lock being held on the resource object by another thread in another transaction;

if not, grants a lock to an accessor associated with the thread and holds the lock until an owner of the thread delists the resource object.

Connor discloses concurrency control for a policy based management system that controls resources in a distributed computing system (Abstract). Connor further discloses controller ID/lease object pairs that have been issued to registered controllers (Figure 3, and Column 5, Lines 22-28).

However, the controller in Connor is not transactional, and there is no indication in Connor that the mapping data structure maintained by the controller service is related to different transactions as embodied in claim 12.

Orton discloses a view system which supports a mechanism to provide a multitask-safe wrapper for objects that are not multitask-safe (abstract).

Similarly, there is no indication in Orton that either the multitask-safe wrapper or the objects that are not multitask-safe are involved in transactions.

Applicant respectfully submits that Connor and other prior art do not teach the above feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 12, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 22 and 31

Claims 22 and 31, while independently patentable, recite limitations that similarly to Claim 12 are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

7

Claims 13-20 and 22-29

Claims 13-20 and 22-29 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

IV.   Additional Amendments

Claims 32-33 have been newly added by the present Reply. Applicant respectfully requests that new Claims 32-33 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

V.   Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 19, 2009   By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
                                                  Kuiran (Ted) Liu
                                                  Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928

Attorney Docket No.: ORACL-01338US2
M:\tliu\wp\ORACL\1300-1350\1338US2\oracl_1338us2_Response_081709_FOA.doc